REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mannering (U.S. patent no. 6,404,804). Regarding claims 1 and 8, the Examiner states that Mannering discloses:

> ... a method comprising: monitoring a bit (in register CMD/STAT 30-fig.2) in a coprocessor (processor master DSP 22-fig.2) included in a packet engine (modem 20-fig.2) that represents an operation associated with a packet processor (computer D12/D14-fig.1) that includes the packet engine; and
> providing the packet engine the status of the bit (col.6, lines 24-26, and col.7, line 7-col.8, line 12).

Applicant disagrees. Claim 1 recites "a method of monitoring a digital subscriber line, the method comprising applying in a coprocessor a logical mask to a status word, the status word comprising a plurality of bits, the coprocessor included in a packet engine that represents an operation associated with a packet processor that includes the packet engine," (emphasis added). Mannering describes a method for determining "whether bits of at least one sub-group having a common order of location comprise at least one erroneous bit" (col. 3, ln. 64-66). Mannering neither describes nor suggests monitoring a digital subscriber line by applying a in a coprocessor a logical mask as described by claim 1.

Amended claim 8 calls for a computer program product comprising instructions "to apply in a coprocessor a logical mask to a status word...with the mask applied according to a monitoring scheme for a digital subscriber line." Mannering does not provide this limitation as set forth above.

Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Regarding claim 15, Examiner states that Mannering

> discloses a line monitor (computer D14-- fig.1) comprises: a computing device executing (modem 20, fig.2): a process to monitor a bit (in register CMD/STAT 30-fig.2) in a coprocessor (processor master DSP 22-fig.2) included in a packet engine (modem 20-fig.2) that represents an operation associated with a packet processor (computer D12D14—fig.1) that includes the packet engine; and a process to provide the packet engine the status of the bit (col.6, lines 24-26, and col.7, line 7-col.8, line 12).

Applicant disagrees. Amended claim 15 describes a line monitor comprising a process "to monitor a digital subscriber line by applying in a coprocessor a logical mask to a status word... the coprocessor included in a packet engine that represents an operation associated with a packet processor that includes the packet engine." Mannering neither describes nor suggests this limitation.

Dependent claims 16-21 are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claim on which they depend is patentable.

Regarding claim 22, the Examiner alleges that Mannering

> discloses a system (fig.1) comprising; a coprocessor (processor master DSP 22-fig.2) included in a packet engine (modem 20-fig.2) that is capable of, monitoring a bit (in register CMD/STAT 30-fig.2) representing an operation associated with a packet processor (computer D12/D14—fig.1) that includes the packet engine; and providing the packet engine the status of the bit (col.6, lines 24-26, and col.7, line 7-col.8, line 12).

Applicant disagrees. Amended claim 22 calls for "a system comprising a coprocessor included in a packet engine that is capable of monitoring a digital subscriber line by applying in a coprocessor a logical mask to a status word, the status word comprising a plurality of bits representing an operation associated with a packet processor that includes the packet engine." Mannering neither describes nor suggests this limitation as discussed above.

Dependent claims 23-24 are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claim on which they depend is patentable.

Amended claim 25 calls for "a packet forwarding device comprising a coprocessor included in a packet engine that is capable of applying a logical mask to a status word comprising a plurality of bits, the coprocessor included in a packet engine representing an operation associated with a packet processor that includes the packet engine" (emphasis added) and claim 28 includes the feature of "… a network processor that includes the network processing engine." Mannering neither describes nor suggests this limitation as discussed above.

Dependent claims 26-27 and 29-30 are patentable for at least similar reasons as those for the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:May 22, 2008

/Denis G. Maloney/
Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21930315.doc